



# City of Glendale

5850 West Glendale Avenue  
Glendale, AZ 85301

## City Council Workshop Agenda

*Mayor Jerry Weiers*  
*Vice Mayor Ian Hugh*  
*Councilmember Jamie Aldama*  
*Councilmember Joyce Clark*  
*Councilmember Ray Malnar*  
*Councilmember Lauren Tolmachoff*  
*Councilmember Bart Turner*

---

Tuesday, February 21, 2017

1:30 PM

Council Chambers

---

### Workshop

One or more members of the City Council may be unable to attend the Workshop or Executive Session Meeting in person and may participate telephonically, pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431(4).

#### CALL TO ORDER

#### ROLL CALL

#### WORKSHOP SESSION

- [17-045](#) DISCUSSION OF STATUS OF GLENDALE'S COLORADO RIVER SUPPLY AND EFFORTS TO HELP MITIGATE THE RAPID WATER LEVEL DECLINE IN LAKE MEAD THROUGH THE DROUGHT CONTINGENCY PLAN  
Staff Contact: Craig Johnson, P.E., Director, Water Services  
Staff Presenter: Doug Kupel, PhD, Deputy Director, Water Services  
Staff Presenter: Drew Swieczkowski, Environmental Program Manager, Water Services
- [17-047](#) COUNCIL ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST: TRANSIT SERVICES FARE STRUCTURE  
Staff Contact: Jack Friedline, Director, Public Works  
Staff Presenter: Trevor Ebersole, Deputy Director, Public Works  
Staff Presenter: Kevin Link, Transit Administrator, Public Works

#### CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

**This report allows the City Manager to update the City Council. The City Council may only acknowledge the contents to this report and is prohibited by state law from discussing or acting on any of the items presented by the City Manager since they are not itemized on the Council Workshop Agenda.**

#### CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

**This report allows the City Attorney to update the City Council. The City Council may only acknowledge the contents to this report and is prohibited by state law from discussing or acting on any of the items presented by the City Attorney since they are not itemized on the Council Workshop Agenda.**

#### **COUNCIL ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST**

**Councilmembers may indicate topic(s) they would like to have discussed by the Council at a future Workshop and the reason for their interest. The Council does not discuss the new topics at the Workshop where they are introduced.**

#### **MOTION AND CALL TO ENTER INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

#### **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

##### **1. LEGAL MATTERS**

A. The City Council will meet with the City Attorney for legal advice, discussion and consultation regarding the city's position in pending or contemplated litigation, including settlement discussions conducted in order to avoid or resolve litigation. (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(3)(4))

B. Council will meet to discuss and consider records exempt by law from public inspection and are specifically required to be maintained as confidential by state or federal law. (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(4))

C. Discussion/consultation with the City Attorney to receive an update, to consider its position, and to provide instruction/direction to the City Attorney regarding Glendale's position in connection with pending or contemplated litigation, or in settlement discussions conducted in order to avoid or resolve litigation (A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A)(3)(4))

##### **2. LEGAL MATTERS - PROPERTY & CONTRACTS**

A. Discussion/consultation with the City Attorney to consider its position, and to provide instruction/direction to the City Attorney regarding Glendale's position in connection with a contract relating to the acquisition of property in the area of 83rd Avenue and Camelback Road which is the subject of negotiations. (A.R.S. §§ 38-431.03 (A)(3)(4)(7))

B. Discussion/consultation with the City Attorney to consider its position, and to provide instruction/direction to the City Attorney regarding Glendale's position in connection with a contract relating to the acquisition of property in the area of 71st Avenue and Glendale Avenue which is the subject of negotiations. (A.R.S. §§ 38-431.03 (A)(3)(4)(7))

C. Discussion and consultation with the City Attorney to receive an update, consider its position and provide instruction and direction to the City Attorney regarding Glendale's position in connection with agreements associated with the area of 91st Avenue and Glendale Avenue. (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(3)(4))

D. Discussion and consultation with the City Attorney to receive an update, consider its position and provide instruction and direction to the City Attorney regarding Glendale's position in connection with agreements associated with the area of 83rd Avenue and Beardsley Avenue. (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(3)(4))

Upon a public majority vote of a quorum of the City Council, the Council may hold an executive session, which will not be open to the public, regarding any item listed on the agenda but only for the following purposes:

- (i) discussion or consideration of personnel matters (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(1));
- (ii) discussion or consideration of records exempt by law from public inspection (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(2));
- (iii) discussion or consultation for legal advice with the city's attorneys (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(3));
- (iv) discussion or consultation with the city's attorneys regarding the city's position regarding contracts that are the subject of negotiations, in pending or contemplated litigation, or in settlement discussions conducted in order to avoid or resolve litigation (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(4));
- (v) discussion or consultation with designated representatives of the city in order to consider its position and instruct its representatives regarding negotiations with employee organizations (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(5)); or
- (vi) discussing or consulting with designated representatives of the city in order to consider its position and instruct its representatives regarding negotiations for the purchase, sale or lease of real property (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(7)).

#### Confidentiality

Arizona statute precludes any person receiving executive session information from disclosing that information except as allowed by law. A.R.S. § 38-431.03(F). Each violation of this statute is subject to a civil penalty not to exceed \$500, plus court costs and attorneys' fees. This penalty is assessed against the person who violates this statute or who knowingly aids, agrees to aid or attempts to aid another person in violating this article. The city is precluded from expending any public monies to employ or retain legal counsel to provide legal services or representation to the public body or any of its officers in any legal action commenced for violation of the statute unless the City Council takes a legal action at a properly noticed open meeting to approve of such expenditure prior to incurring any such obligation or indebtedness. A.R.S. § 38-431.07(A)(B).



## Legislation Description

---

**File #: 17-045, Version: 1**

---

### **DISCUSSION OF STATUS OF GLENDALE'S COLORADO RIVER SUPPLY AND EFFORTS TO HELP MITIGATE THE RAPID WATER LEVEL DECLINE IN LAKE MEAD THROUGH THE DROUGHT CONTINGENCY PLAN**

Staff Contact: Craig Johnson, P.E., Director, Water Services

Staff Presenter: Doug Kupel, PhD, Deputy Director, Water Services

Staff Presenter: Drew Swieczkowski, Environmental Program Manager, Water Services

#### **Purpose and Policy Guidance**

The purpose of this item is to provide City Council with information on the City's Colorado River supply including proposals to reduce the rapid water level declines in Lake Mead. A future Glendale contribution of \$100,000 per year for three years may be necessary to support proposed programs needed to protect our Colorado River supply.

#### **Background**

**Glendale's Water Supply-** Glendale has a diverse and robust water supply. The City receives 40 percent of its total water supply from the Colorado River, delivered through the Central Arizona Project (CAP) canal. Another 40 percent comes from the Salt River Project (SRP) from the Salt and Verde Rivers and SRP's six reservoirs. The City pumps about 13 percent of its water from groundwater wells, and the other 7 percent of our water portfolio comes from reclaimed water. Colorado River water is stored in Lake Mead and Lake Powell. It is delivered from the CAP canal to the City's Pyramid Peak water treatment plant where it is treated and readied for use.

Glendale has a 100-year Designation of Assured Water Supply (DAWS) by the Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR). This designation assures our citizens and those looking to build and invest in Glendale that we have adequate current and future water resources. The DAWS takes into consideration all of our water supplies and volumes and weighs this against our current and future demands. Our current DAWS was re-issued in 2010 and must be renewed again in 2025. Having a resilient and reliable Colorado River water supply will benefit this re-designation process.

**Glendale's Commitment to Conserve-** The City has taken previous measures to help stabilize water levels in Lake Mead. In 2016, Council approved storing 1,000 acre-feet of our Colorado River supply in Lake Mead. In total, four municipalities (including Glendale) stored about 16,000 acre-feet of water in Lake Mead. This program allowed Glendale and the other municipalities to take alternative delivery of a portion of their CAP water and resulted in an "Intentionally Created Surplus" of water in Lake Mead to help slow water level declines.

Water Services is also actively involved with a broad range of water conservation programs to ensure that the City is doing its part to reduce total water demand throughout our boundaries. The City also recharges some

of our Colorado River supply underground so that it is available for use in the future.

***The Colorado River-*** Watersheds in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico feed the Colorado River. The Colorado River Compact of 1922 divided Colorado River users into Upper and Lower Basin States. The Upper Basin States include Colorado, Wyoming, Utah and New Mexico. The Lower Basin States include Arizona, California and Nevada. Both the Upper and Lower Basin States were each allocated 7.5 million acre-feet of Colorado River water per year.

The 7.5 million acre-foot Lower Basin states allocation is divided such that Arizona receives 2.8 million acre-feet per year, California receives 4.4 million acre-feet per year and Nevada receives 300,000 acre-feet per year. Mexico also receives 1.5 million acre-feet per year in accordance with a Treaty signed in 1944.

***Central Arizona Project and Glendale-*** The Central Arizona Project (CAP) is entitled to about 1.5 million acre-feet per year of Arizona's 2.8 million acre-feet allocation. The water that is delivered through the CAP carries different priority levels which are used to determine which water would be cut first in any shortage declaration. Glendale has a high priority municipal and industrial contract with the CAP for 17,236 acre-feet per year. We also have other Colorado River water supply and entitlements that are a mix of high and lower priority water. These entitlements total an additional 7,859 acre-feet per year that are also delivered through the CAP canal. The City's total Colorado River water supply available for delivery through the CAP canal is 25,095 acre-feet per year.

***The Drought and Lake Mead-*** The western United States has been in a 17 year drought which has reduced Colorado River flows into both Lake Powell and Lake Mead. Lake Mead has experienced severe water level declines of more than 130 feet since the year 2000. The cause of this decline is that more water is leaving Lake Mead than is entering into it. This deficit is estimated to be about 1.2 million acre-feet annually, resulting in a lake elevation decline of 10 to 12 feet each year. To address the decline in Lake Mead, guidelines were put in place early on in the drought to help safeguard Lake Mead from reaching extreme low water levels.

***The 2007 Interim Guidelines-*** The 2007 Guidelines contain three shortage triggers in Lake Mead each associated with a specific lake elevation level. The Lake Mead elevation levels are set at 1075 feet, 1050 feet, and 1025 feet. As the water level drops and reach each of these trigger points, Arizona, Nevada, and Mexico will lose a portion of their Colorado River water supply. California does not have a reduction of their Colorado River Allocation within the 2007 Guidelines. If the third shortage trigger of 1025 feet is reached, the total reduction will be 625,000 acre-feet and the U.S. Secretary of Interior would have to make a determination of what to do next to prevent lake levels from dropping below 1000 feet.

***Colorado River Water Shortage Priorities-*** Colorado River water supplies delivered through the CAP canal have different priority levels that help determine which water will be cut first during a shortage. The lowest priority levels are cut first and include the Excess Pool water and the Non-Indian Agriculture (NIA) water. The highest priority levels are the Municipal and Industrial supply and the Indian pool water supplies. Glendale's Colorado River supplies currently contain 90% of the higher priority water.

***The Drought Contingency Plan-*** While the 2007 Guidelines helped manage the decline in Lake Mead water levels, the drought has continued. Current projections show that if no action is taken to address the gap

between supply and demand, Lake Mead water levels could progressively worsen. To prevent Lake Mead water levels from reaching the three shortage tiers and specifically to absolutely protect Lake Mead from falling below elevation 1020 feet, a Drought Contingency Plan (DCP) is being discussed by the three Lower Basin States. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Republic of Mexico have joined in the discussions as well.

The DCP overlays the 2007 guidelines and would require deeper reductions to Arizona's and Nevada's Colorado River supply. The DCP adds an additional shortage tier at elevation 1090 feet. Since the water level in Lake Mead is already below this level, Arizona, Nevada and the Bureau of Reclamation would immediately reduce use by a total of 192,000 acre-feet if DCP is approved. The DCP also calls for California to give up a portion of its supply. Mexico would also share in the shortage.

When shortage tier three is reached in the DCP, a total of over 1.3 million acre-feet would be reduced for all entities. This is an increased overall reduction of 700,000 acre-feet when compared to the 2007 Guideline reductions. Under the DCP, Arizona's total reductions increase to 720,000 acre-feet from a total of 480,000 acre-feet under the 2007 Guidelines.

ADWR has been leading the process and has asked that all water sectors (municipal/industrial, agriculture and Indian communities) show their support of DCP. ADWR would like to have preliminary pledges of support while seeking approval from the Arizona State Legislature.

***The Drought Contingency Plan Plus-*** During the review process in Arizona, concerns were raised by the agricultural and Indian community water sectors. To meet these concerns, an additional overlay to the DCP plan has been proposed by ADWR. This plan is being called DCP Plus and helps further protect Lake Mead from entering into the first shortage tier at 1075 feet through 2020.

DCP Plus calls for additional voluntary storage of 1.2 million acre-feet of water in Lake Mead for a period of three years. Modeling has shown that this additional storage of water will help keep the water level elevation in Lake Mead above the first shortage tier. This will reduce the risk of reductions of Colorado River water to agriculture and Indian communities during the three years of the program. DCP Plus would also help reduce the risk of the City losing a small portion of its lower priority Non-Indian Agricultural Colorado River supply.

***Funding for Drought Contingency Plan Plus-*** The additional Colorado River water that will be stored in Lake Mead to help avoid reaching the first shortage tier is the key part of DCP Plus. The water to be stored (called compensated water) is planned to be purchased at \$150/acre-foot and will total \$62 million over the three-year program. The key funding sources that have been identified are the Federal Government, State of Arizona, City of Phoenix, and the Arizona Municipal Water Users Association (AMWUA) member cities (which includes Glendale).

The total requested funding for the AMWUA cities is \$3 million based on each city's share of Colorado River supply allocation. Glendale's prorated contribution is estimated to be \$100,000 per year over a three-year period.

## **Analysis**

The City's Colorado River supply is an integral part of the City's water supply portfolio. To help ensure the

long-term stability of this supply it must be protected with programs enacted to slow the ongoing water level declines in Lake Mead. Water Services staff has recommended to management that Glendale pledge its support of the DCP Plus program and the financial contribution of \$100,000 per year over a three-year period. The DCP Plus program provides both short and long-term benefits to Glendale by protecting Lake Mead elevations from reaching the shortage triggers prescribed in the 2007 Guidelines.

Funding is available from Water Services CIP funds set aside for recharge and storage of Colorado River water. This would still leave \$400,000 per year to be used for recharge activities while the other \$100,000 would go towards funding DCP Plus.

### **Community Benefit/Public Involvement**

A Framework Group has been assembled to oversee the implementation of the Drought Contingency Plan in Arizona. The group contains members from all water sectors in Arizona, including the Arizona Municipal Water Users Association (AMWUA). This Framework Group is advancing the goal of regional collaboration between all Arizona water sectors.

It is important that the City maintain its current 100-year Assured Water Supply Designation from the ADWR. The City's Colorado River supply is an important part of that designation. The DCP Plus program will aid in protecting the City's Colorado River supply, our ADWR Assured Water Supply Designation, and will enhance the City's future growth and economic stability.



## Legislation Description

---

**File #: 17-047, Version: 1**

---

### **COUNCIL ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST: TRANSIT SERVICES FARE STRUCTURE**

Staff Contact: Jack Friedline, Director, Public Works

Staff Presenter: Trevor Ebersole, Deputy Director, Public Works

Staff Presenter: Kevin Link, Transit Administrator, Public Works

### **Purpose and Policy Guidance**

This presentation is in response to a Council Item of Special Interest Mayor Weiers requested at the August 2, 2016 Council Workshop, regarding the fare structure for Dial-A-Ride (DAR) users, and specifically the higher rate charged for service provided under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Transit staff is seeking guidance from Council regarding the possibility of adjusting transit fares. Glendale's last transit fare adjustment occurred in September of 1991.

### **Background**

Dial-A-Ride service began in 1975 in Glendale as an innovative transportation program. The program was initially a six-month demonstration project and was the first of its kind in Arizona. The project came about in response from the City Council, who at that time expressed an interest in providing general public transit service to the downtown area connecting low income housing and Glendale Community College.

The city first contracted with a small private provider to implement the DAR program. The program started with two vans and serviced a 3.5 square mile area. One-way ridership during the first year was 1,570 passengers.

In 1977, the city took over the DAR operation. The service expanded over the years, as demand and the need for public transit continued to grow. Currently, DAR service is available citywide to the general public, with a service area of 55 square miles, and is available for same day pickup with limited reservation capabilities. In Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-16, one-way ridership on the DAR system was 74,256 passengers.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, Dial-A-Ride service was expanded to include ADA paratransit (federal term for ADA DAR) service to disabled persons who have been certified as ADA eligible, through the Valley Metro eligibility process. This enhanced service provides disabled persons more flexibility than non-ADA service by operating additional hours outside of DAR, tighter pickup schedules (one-hour window), advanced reservations, and door to door service. ADA certified individuals have the option of choosing ADA paratransit service at a higher fare or same day service for a reduced fare.

The city also participates in the Regional ADA paratransit service through a Transit Services Agreement with the Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA). ADA eligible residents of any of the Valley Metro partner



cities can request service that will transport the rider anywhere within the metropolitan area that is within an ADA service area. Riders are charged a flat one-way fare (\$4.00) for this service and the customer's city of residency pays the remaining balance of the trip.

In addition to Dial-A-Ride/ADA paratransit service, the Transit Division also manages the Glendale Urban Shuttle (GUS) service. GUS 1 and 2 run the same route but in opposite directions with the boundaries being 52nd to 67th Avenues, and just south of Glendale Avenue to Northern Avenue, providing transportation to local destinations. The GUS 3 route is from 53rd to 65th Avenues, just south of Northern Avenue to just north of Peoria Avenue. The route for GUS 1 and 2 is 6.1 miles long. The route for GUS 3 is 10.4 miles long. Passengers can transfer between all three GUS routes at the 55th Avenue and Northern stop. In FY 2015-16, GUS ridership was 90,911 boardings.

**Analysis**

Glendale is one of only two cities (Peoria) in the Valley that provides DAR service to the general public, provides internal operation of the service, and does not charge the maximum allowable under law of \$4 for ADA paratransit trips (ADA fares are restricted to no more than twice the fixed route rate currently set by Valley Metro at \$2 per ride). Currently, the average per trip cost for Dial-A-Ride is \$33.90.

The current fare structure along with a proposed adjustment is below:

DAR	Current	Proposed
General public (age 14-64) -	\$2.00	\$5.00
Seniors (age 65 or older) -	\$1.00	\$2.00
Disabled (non-ADA) -	\$1.00	\$2.00
ADA (internal trips) -	\$2.00	\$3.00
Regional ADA Service -	\$4.00	\$4.00
Juniors (age 6-13) -	\$1.00	\$2.00
Child (age 5 and younger) -	Free	Free
Group rates (4 or more paying passengers)		
General public (age 14-64) -	\$1.00	\$3.00
Senior, Disabled, Junior -	\$0.50	\$1.00
GUS	Current	Proposed
General Public	\$.25	Free
Child (age 5 and younger)	Free	Free
Seniors/Disabled Patrons between 10am-2pm	\$0.10	Free

As noted previously, the last fare adjustment was in 1991. Anytime fares are adjusted, there is an expected proportional, possibly temporary, decrease in ridership. The general rule of thumb within the transit industry is for every 10 percent increase in fares, an agency can expect to see a 4 percent decrease in ridership. This proportional relationship has been quantified by various studies that have been conducted across the country over the years. At the proposed adjustments, there is an expectation of a 60 percent decrease in ridership within the general public category; a 40 percent ridership decrease in the seniors and disabled category; and a

20 percent decrease in ADA ridership. Of the total 74,256 passengers in FY 2015-16, 54% were senior and disabled fares, 10% were regular fares (general public, junior fares) and 6% rode in the other category (free, child under 5, PCA). ADA fares in the same period, which include ADA trips within the city as well as customers transferring in and out of Glendale, made up just over 30 percent of total ridership.

Larger fare adjustments might have other impacts. For example, if the ADA fare were to be increased to \$4.00, ADA clients may choose to use the more costly regional service if the fare is the same for a trip within Glendale as it is to other neighboring city locations. The difference between Glendale's internal ADA fare and regional ADA service fares may also serve as an incentive for residents to stay and shop in Glendale, rather than go outside the city for their needs. The same holds true for the recommended senior and disabled fare. It is also possible that if fares are adjusted to the same amount across the board, there will be an increase in persons who become ADA certified eligible for city and regional ADA paratransit service. The ADA legislation restricts the flexibility a provider has with ADA trips. Specifically, the legislation stipulates that an ADA client who is booking an ADA trip must be picked up within an hour of his or her requested pick-up time. That does not hold true if a resident, who is ADA eligible, is booking a non-ADA trip. Staff tries to pick riders up as close to the requested time as possible, but if availability is limited, the client's pick-up time may be more than an hour after their requested time. Having a lower fare for non-ADA trips provides an incentive for residents to use non-ADA service. This flexibility in scheduling increases productivity and can reduce costs.

GUS service provides a convenient and low cost option of transportation for Glendale residents to local destinations which include downtown, restaurants, retail locations, adult living facilities, Glendale libraries, Glendale Adult Center, Glendale High School, and Glendale Community College, among other key locations. GUS operates an average cost per rider of \$8.67 and is mainly funded through the GO (Glendale Onboard) sales tax.

### **Community Benefit/Public Involvement**

Dial-A-Ride, ADA paratransit, and GUS services provide a benefit to Glendale residents offering convenient and affordable transportation options for residents who rely on public transportation. A fare adjustment would require citizen input in the form of a public meeting(s), which would be scheduled for some time in the April-May timeframe.

### **Budget and Financial Impacts**

Fares received in Fiscal Year 2015-16 for DAR services equaled \$92,016, with expenses totaling \$2,516,912, which equates to a 3.65 percent fare recovery ratio. A fare adjustment as outlined above is expected to generate an additional \$23,907 in revenue. Conversely, fares for GUS over the same period equaled \$21,676. Elimination of these fares combined with the DAR fare increases would equate to a net revenue increase of \$2,231 depending on actual ridership decreases.

The FY 2016-17 operating budget for DAR is \$2,849,318 which includes the budget for the Regional Paratransit Service. The adjustment in fares would represent less than 1% of operating costs.